

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The above-captioned patent application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action to which the Amendment is responsive. The abstract of the disclosure was objected to because of its length. A new abstract has been substituted that is less than 150 words.

Claims 1-31 are pending. Claims 2, 3, 30 and 31 have been cancelled and new claims 32-36 have been added. Claims 11-25 have been allowed and claims 7, 8 and 29 have been objected to, but the examiner has indicated that they contain allowable subject matter. Claim 7 has been rewritten in independent form and therefore it is respectfully submitted that claims 7 and 8 are now in condition for allowance. Claims 9 and 10 have been amended to correct misspellings and not in response to any prior art rejection, nor are the corrections narrowing the scope of these claims.

Claims 1-4, and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takahashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,019,622). Claims 1, 2, 5, 10, and 26-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lukas et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,258,977). Claims 1 and 9 have been rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Moulin (U.S. Patent No. 4,820,185). Reconsideration is respectfully requested based on the amended claims and the following discussion.

In order to anticipate under the Statute, each and every essentially claimed limitation must be found in the single cited reference. Those limitations that are not found must be notoriously well known to one of sufficient skill in the field.

In order to raise a "prima facie" obviousness rejection, each and every claimed limitation must also be present in the cited art, either singly or in combination, at the time of the invention to one of sufficient (e.g., ordinary) skill in the field of the invention. Those features that are not found or suggested must be very well known to those of ordinary skill in the field.

The present inventive device is an assembly for housing electronic components, such as a printed circuit board or the like in a filter or trap used in a

CATV system. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the hollow body member is for housing an electronic device as opposed to connectors and terminations disclosed in the cited prior art, and to recite that the threaded connector is part of the header as opposed to part of the putative body member housing a collet assembly as disclosed in Takahashi et al. The cooperative structure that rotationally locks the header with its threaded connector to the body member is further recited as a notch in one of the body member and the header and a corresponding tab in the other. Locking these components to one another prevents the application of torque to the electronic components within the body member caused by relative rotational movement between the body and the header. Rotational movement between these may cause failure of the housed electronic component such as by the fracture of a printed circuit board or shorting of an enclosed circuit. The disclosed termination connector of a distribution box or splitter of Takahashi et al., does not enclose an electronic device, but merely makes an electrical connection. Consequently, Takahashi et al. does not disclose, among other things, a body member for housing an electronic device nor a header with a threaded connector and cannot anticipate claim 1 as amended or claims 4 or 10 depending therefrom. It should also be noted that the body member of Takahashi et al is integral to the wall of the distribution box or splitter and therefore is not subject to the rotational torque in the manner that the freestanding body member of the present assembly is during installation in a CATV system.

Figures 1 and 3 of Lukas et al. disclose two variations of a fiber optic connector for a single pair of fibers. The examiner however, has referenced only the embodiment depicted in Figure 3. This embodiment also fails to disclose all of the limitations of claim 1 as amended. As with Takahashi et al., Lukas et al discloses a connector and not an enclosure for an electronic device. Therefore, the putative body member of Lukas et al. does not house an electronic device but merely a fiber optic connection. Additionally, the plug 36 does not have a central axis, but rather the axis is offset to assist in the alignment of the mating fiber optic cables. Furthermore, while the plug 36 does use a projection 42 that snap engages with an aperture 43, the plug or putative header does not have a threaded connector as now

recited in claim 1. Although the alternative embodiment of Figure 1 of Lukas et al. does disclose a header 26 with a threaded connector, this embodiment does not use the required cooperating structure of a tab extending into a notch to rotationally lock the header and body together. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Lukas et al. to combine these features because there is no electronic component within the body member that requires protection from relative rotational movement between the header and the body. Therefore, Lukas et al. cannot anticipate claim 1 as amended as it fails to teach each and every limitation of the claim 1 or claim 5 and 10 depending therefrom. As with Takahashi et al., it should be noted that the fiber optic connectors of Lukas et al. are designed to be affixed to a bulkhead 29 and therefore are not subject to the rotational torque in the manner that the freestanding body member of the present assembly is during installation of the enclosure in a CATV system.

Claims 26-28 have been amended to require the forming of an axially extending notch at the first end of the hollow body member and the forming of an axially extending tab from the annular portion of the header. The method now requires the slip fitting of the axially extending tab into the axially extending notch as opposed to the snap engagement of the protrusion 42 into the aperture 43 in Lukas et al. The slip fitting is all that is required over the snap engagement because the invention at issue involves the rotational locking of the header to the body. In contrast, the snap engagement restricts the axial movement of the plug 36 from the body 35. Therefore, claim 26 as amended overcomes the rejection based on the cited prior art.

With respect to Moulin, claim 1 has been amended to expressly require a cooperative structure of a notch in one of the body member or header and a tab in the other so as to rotationally lock the header to the body. Such structure is absent in Moulin. Additionally, the connector of Moulin does not include a body for housing an electronic device, but merely forms the connection of an array of optical fibers. Moreover, the coupling mechanism of Moulin is designed to counteract "axial tensile forces" on the coupling (col. 1, ll. 45-47) as opposed to the rotational locking

Serial No.: 10/764,845
Amendment Dated: June 2, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 4, 2005

Atty. Docket No.: 205_085
Express Mail Label No. EV303760128US

which is the focus of the present invention. As the rotational locking resulting from the notch and tab structures expressly claimed in the present invention are not disclosed or suggested in Moulin, the claims as amended cannot be anticipated or rendered obvious by this cited art for failing to include or suggest these essential claimed features.


In summary, Applicant submits that the pending claims, as amended, are now in an allowable condition and such allowance is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner wishes to expedite disposition of the above-captioned patent application, he is invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0289.

Respectfully submitted,

WALL MARJAMA & BILINSKI LLP

By: 
James R. Muldoon
Reg. No. 38,249

Telephone: (315) 425-9000

Customer No.: 20874